

**THE PRESS
EDITORIAL**

**Unethical actions
by city police ?**

Last week the *Press* printed the editorial "Delta Kappa: Scapegoats?" which dealt with the large "fund raiser" sponsored by the fraternity almost a month ago. Recently another issue has arisen pertaining to the tactics used by police to obtain statements from some people leaving the party so they could arrest the alleged law breakers.

According to some of the people who were questioned as they left the party, the police "harassed" them and "intimidated" them; intimidated them and harassed them to the point of forcing them to make and sign a statement which led to the arrest of five members of the Delta Kappa Beta fraternity.

Those arrested can receive up to 22 years in jail and a \$22,000 fine each maximum if convicted. Should that high a price sit on the basis of forced statements and intimidated witnesses?

The witnesses that talked about the questioning by police were both female and said that there were "about ten" other females at the station when they were brought in for questioning.

They said that as they left the Delta Kappa house they were called aside by two police who "talked threatening" to them as they asked for name, address, and proof of age. One witness said the police officer told her that if she didn't cooperate he would call the sergeant.

The police also allegedly told them that if they didn't give a statement they would be issued a subpoena so they would have to appear in court to testify. The police, according to the witnesses, were very intimidating and unpleasant to them. One witness was also brought to tears when she was down at the police station because, she said the police were giving her hard time.

It seems like the police are in a sense being paradoxical. They intimidate and harass a female to the point of tears so they can arrest another student and yet turn around and profess to be doing something about the ski-mask suspect running around campus.

One witness asked the police why they only asked females, because when she was at the station she only saw females, no males. The police replied by saying that females were easier to tell if they were underage.

This type of action by the police, though not illegal, is certainly not ethical. One might start to question some other tactics that might have been used by them to make arrests.

One has to wonder how these statements will stand up in a court of law.

THE PRESS

Non Illegitimus Carborundum

Theresa Howard
EDITOR

Bing Miller
MANAGING EDITOR

- News Editors Virginia Martin and Danette Gilson
- Opinions Editor Carol Slattery
- Sports Editor Bob Velez
- Insider Editor Diane Iriarte
- Photography Editor Jill Steeley
- Photography Assistant Kimm Schummacker
- Darkroom Manager Lisa Sherman
- Associated Press Editor Joan Ziff
- Business Manager Pattie Rodman
- Circulation Manager Mark Chase
- Advertising Manager Meg Sirianna
- Advertising Assistants Holly Mabe
Ann Miller
Michele Cooper
- Advisor Jane Rhodes

Print Shop Managers:
Terrence P. Brennan, Kira Silverbird

Typesetting Staff:
Amy Allen, Colleen Hamilton, Rhonda Hawes.

Staff Reporters:
Theresa Van Valen, Joan Ziff, Matthew DiTomasso,
Bob Velez, JoAnn Dewar, Lee Ann Begleiter,
Maureen Joyce, Barbara Leombruno.

The Press
Room 111, Corey Union
Cortland, N.Y. 13045
(607) 753-2803, 2804, 2805

**THE PRESS
OPINIONS**

Is Daniloff a hero?

By DAVID ROSSIE

*But what good came of it at last?
Quoth little Peterkin.
"Why that I cannot tell," said he,
"But 'twas a famous victory."*

Like Robert Southey's *Battle of Blenheim*, the Nicholas Daniloff affair is being touted as a famous victory by those who want to see it that way, and as a rout by those who prefer that interpretation.

That's not surprising, considering our national penchant for trying to squeeze things into won-lost columns. But it's discouraging, because in the realm of international diplomacy, where the Daniloff-Zakharov issue was decided, there are too many murky areas to permit such neat delineation.

I have had no difficulty whatever controlling my enthusiasm for Ronald Reagan's presidency. But it's impossible not to feel a twinge of sympathy for him in this instance, beset as he is by some of the very people who have heretofore hailed him as the messiah of the New Right, but now denounce him for knuckling under to the Soviets.

Sure, Reagan and his people exacerbated the problem with their almost daily position changes during the first couple of weeks after the Soviets arrested Daniloff in obvious retaliation for the arrest of Genandiy Zakharov, a Soviet employee at the United Nations, on a spying charge.

To make matters worse, we were subjected to a lot of self-serving tough talk by such fearless spectators as Henry Kissinger, Jeane Kirkpatrick and George Will, none of whom, unlike Daniloff, was languishing in a KGB jail cell.

While a deal was being cut that would see Daniloff swapped for Zakharov, and two Soviet dissidents, Yuri and Irina Orlov, allowed to emigrate in exchange for some Soviet U.N. mission employees being allowed to remain here, pundits with nothing better to do entertained us with penetrating analyses designed to prove that: Reagan had blinked; Mikhail Gorbachev had blinked. The two had blinked in concert, but one had blinked harder than the other.

Reagan and his people did not help matters by pretending the Daniloff-Zakharov swap was not a swap, but rather two coincidental events that just happened to take place within 24 hours of one another. The president only added to the confusion when, in response to a reporter's question: "Did we blink?" he replied, "No, they blinked."

The next day, having checked the official blink meter, the president decided the Soviets hadn't blinked. In fact, nobody had blinked. Good. Let's leave it that way.

What the New Right critics of the president's decision apparently chose to overlook, but what the president and some of his advisors — the prevailing ones fortunately — did not overlook was that intransigence on the Daniloff-Zakharov issue would have worsened American-Soviet relations, which are none too good to begin with, and would have almost certainly scuttled any hopes for a nuclear arms reduction agreement between the two countries.

Well, so what? the hardliners argue. The Soviet government is ruthless and duplicitous and there's no doing business with it anyway. Yes, it is ruthless and it is duplicitous, but like it or not it is there. It is powerful. It is entrenched. It is not going to go away, and it is something we are going to have to live with and do business with.

That aspect of the case raises some disturbing questions. Was Zakharov's arrest, coming when it did, intended to disrupt arms negotiations and progress toward another Reagan-Gorbachev summit meeting? And might those who ordered Daniloff's arrest have had the same goal in mind? The possibility has to be considered.

In any event, Daniloff is back to a hero's welcome, although how he qualifies as a hero escapes me. Maybe it's because we must have heroes, even if we have to manufacture them, just as we must have won-lost columns. And Zakharov is also back home to whatever awaits him.

I know I should not admit this, but the more I saw of the two men on television, the more grudging admiration I had for Zakharov and the less I had for Daniloff.

When we saw Zakharov he was quiet and controlled, a man seemingly resigned to whatever fate had in store for him. Once outside his cell, Daniloff became a media star. Every time we saw him he was hopping around around before the cameras and waving his arms in the air like someone who had just won a refrigerator on one of those moronic television game shows.

I'm glad it's over.

Rossie is a Binghamton columnist who appears in the *Press*.

Help the hungry

To the Editor:

World Food Day gives us an opportunity to consider some facts related to global hunger. Presently, some five hundred million people experience hunger on a continuing basis, that is, one out of every ten people on planet Earth, approximately 30 million people in America.

The average person in the developed world consumes more than 3,000 calories a day while a person in the developing world get about 2,000 calories. It should be remembered that a body at rest needs 1,600 calories daily.

In rural areas of poor countries, the caloric intake of people is well below the required 1,600. There were long periods during the Ethiopian famine when a person received less than 800 calories a day. Needless to say, malnutrition was rampant, starvation and death common, especially among children under five and expecting and lactating mothers.

For a variety of reasons, mostly man-made, the lives of some 200 million people in Africa will be threatened for years to come because of severe food shortages. Weak political structures, cultural deprivation, poor agricultural policies, and economic exploitation are some of the causes that effect the lives of the poor who hunger.

However, there is enough food produced each year in the world to feed every person on planet Earth. We, the international community, have the know-how and ability to train those in need to grow their own food, and we have the capability to deliver emergency food to those who live in remote areas.

What then is the problem? The problem is that we lack the will. For some reason, we choose to use large portions of global economic resources to develop military capability rather than humanity. Imagine, the world spends 750 billions of dollars a year for armament, 1.4 million

dollars a minute. Some 500,000 scientists are needed for the development, manufacture and delivery of the toys of war. Just think of what might be accomplished if one third of the international military commitment to arms were diverted to the development of the poor who hunger.

But what can I do? I'm only one person. You can do a great deal. You can become a voice for the voiceless by actively participating in the formation of local, corporate and national policies which are more sensitive to the poor who hunger. Encourage your local community, your church or synagogue, your company, your nation to be actively involved in developing the lives of the hungry.

Were it not for the mystery of life, you and your children might be part of the 500 million. Every now and then "Take a friend to lunch" by sending the cost of an afternoon meal to any local or overseas agency that brings hope to the hungry.

Msgr. Robert J. Coll